

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 14-16, 19, and 21 are present in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

§ 102(b) Rejection – Shintai

Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16, 19, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication 2003/0022574 (Shintai). Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection based on the claims as amended.

Present Invention

The present invention relates to wireless systems including one wireless terminal (TV main body) and one base device (wireless center). See Figure 11. The connection protocol for the wireless system works as follows. See Figure 10. The wireless terminal first broadcasts a connection request command (S512). Then, upon receiving the connection request command, the base device transmits its identification data to the wireless terminal (S522). The wireless terminal obtains only the identification data that is received first (S513). The wireless terminal subsequently establishes a connection with the base device indicated by the obtained identification data.

After the establishment of the connection, the wireless terminal broadcasts a connection process completion command to inform the base device of the establishment of the connection (S514). The base device receives the connection process completion command and transmits video data and other data to the wireless terminal. The wireless terminal can thereby properly process the video data and other data received from the base device with which the wireless terminal has established the connection.

Problems can occur with this connection protocol if the connection counterpart notifying means recited in claim 1 or the warning means recited in claim 11 is missing.

For example, a second wireless system may be within the communications range of a first wireless terminal for a wireless system. This can occur if, for example, the first wireless system is in a room in an apartment and the second wireless system is in another room of the same apartment. Simply put, more than one base device exists in the communications range of the first wireless terminal in that situation. Now, when a connection request command is broadcast in S512, each base device responds to the connection request command and transmits its identification data. The wireless terminal, however, only obtains the identification data that it receives first, thereby establishing a connection with the base device indicated in the obtained identification data. Therefore, the wireless terminal connects to only one of the base devices (S502, S513, S512). After the establishment of the connection, the wireless terminal broadcasts a connection process completion command through which either base device recognizes the establishment of the connection. Therefore, the base device that transmitted its identification data without successfully establishing a connection also receives the connection process completion command. This particular base device erroneously recognizes that it has established a connection with the wireless terminal and starts transmitting video data to the wireless terminal (albeit the video data are not processed properly by the wireless terminal). To the user, the non-connected base device appears to be working as if it had successfully connected to the wireless terminal because it is transmitting video data. The user cannot determine if his own base device has been successfully connected. This inconvenience arises from the broadcasting of the connection request command and the connection process completion command and occurs when there are two or more base devices in the communications range of the wireless terminal.

To address the problem, claim 1 includes connection counterpart notifying means for notifying the user of the base device to which the wireless terminal is currently connected. Furthermore, claim 11 includes warning means for warning the user if the connection confirmation command is not received within a predetermined time. With these configurations, the user can reliably ascertain if the base device of the user has been successfully connected.

Comparison of present invention to cited reference

CLAIM 1

The Examiner asserts that the connection requesting means recited in claim 1 is described in Shintai, paragraph [0049]. However, Shintai, paragraph [0049] describes that a message is sent only to a specified destination. The description is clearly not directed to broadcasting. See also Shintai, Figure 9. Therefore, the connection requesting means of claim 1 is not disclosed in Shintai.

The Examiner also asserts that the connection completion notifying means recited in claim 1 is described in Shintai, paragraph [0010]. However, Shintai, paragraph [0010] only describes that a terminal receives, from base stations, an ID number by which the base station is identified. The ID number is not equivalent to the connection process completion command by which the base device recognizes the establishment of the connection. Therefore, the connection completion notifying means of claim 1 is not disclosed in Shintai.

The Examiner also asserts that the connection counterpart notifying means recited in claim 1 is described in Shintai, paragraphs [0010] and [0024]. However, Shintai, paragraphs [0010] and [0024] only describes that a mobile phone receives, from several base stations, their ID numbers and also that one of the base stations is designated to be a communication base station. The user is not notified of the ID numbers of the base stations. Therefore, the connection counterpart notifying means of claim 1 is not disclosed in Shintai.

As detailed above, Shintai does not disclose the connection requesting means, the connection completion notifying means, and the connection counterpart notifying means of claim 1. The rejection based on Shintai fails to establish *prima facie* anticipation.

In addition, since Shintai does not disclose the connection requesting means and the connection completion notifying means of claim 1, the reference does not disclose the connection protocol of claim 1 which involves the connection requesting means, the connection establishing means, and the connection completion notifying means. Therefore, the connection

counterpart notifying means which solves the problems of the connection protocol is not obvious to a person skilled in the art over Shintai.

CLAIM 11

The connection requesting means and the connection completion notifying means in claim 11 are identical to those in claim 1. Therefore, the connection requesting means and the connection completion notifying means of claim 11 are not disclosed in Shintai.

The Examiner also asserts that the warning means recited in claim 11 is described in Shintai, paragraph [0031]. Applicant disagrees. Shintai, paragraphs [0031] to [0033] only describes that it is determined if a predetermined time period has passed since switching from the standby mode to the data communication mode, that if it has not, the ID number of the communication base station is transmitted, and that if it has, information on neighboring base stations is obtained again. The reference is silent about warning issued to the user. Therefore, the warning means in claim 11 is not disclosed in Shintai.

The Examiner also asserts that the connection confirmation means of the present application is described in Shintai, paragraph [0024]. Applicant disagrees. Shintai, paragraph [0024] only describes the ID number of the base station and the assist information for locating a GPS satellite. The paragraph does not describe the connection confirmation command by which a connection is confirmed. Therefore, the connection confirmation means of the present application is not disclosed in Shintai.

In addition, since the connection confirmation command is not disclosed in Shintai, the connection confirmation command transmitting means recited in claim 11 is of course not disclosed by Shintai either.

As detailed above, since Shintai does not disclose the connection requesting means, the connection completion notifying means, the warning means, the connection confirmation means, and the connection confirmation command transmitting means of claim 11. The rejection based on Shintai fails to establish *prima facie* anticipation.

In addition, since Shintai does not disclose the connection requesting means and the connection completion notifying means of claim 1, the reference does not disclose the connection protocol of claim 11 which involves the connection requesting means, the connection establishing means, and the connection completion notifying means. Therefore, the warning means which solves the problems of the connection protocol is not obvious to a person skilled in the art over Shintai.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* anticipation for claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16, 19, and 21. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

§ 103(a) Rejection – Shintai, Pihl

Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintai in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0186707 (Pihl). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that at least for the reasons above for claims 1 and 11, dependent claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 are patentable as well. In addition, Applicant submits that Pihl fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shintai.

Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness and must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at

Application No. 10/553,351
Amendment dated May 19, 2009
After Final Office Action of March 19, 2009

Docket No.: 1248-0827PUS1

the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 19, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Down # 48222
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant